



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/886,954 | 06/21/2001 | Maureen J. Charron | 96700/667 | 6743 |
| 7590 06/16/2004 | | | EXAMINER | |
| Craig J. Arnold, Esq. | | | NICKOL, GARY B | |
| AMSTER, RO 90 Park Avenu | THSTEIN & EBENSTEI | N | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| New York, N | | | 1642 | |

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|---|--|
| | 09/886,954 | CHARRON ET AL. |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Gary B. Nickol Ph.D. | 1642 |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply | appears on the cover sheet wi | th the correspondence address |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a in the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stated and the period for reply will be period for reply will | N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re- reply within the statutory minimum of thirt- iod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tute, cause the application to become AB | eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). |
| Status | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 | <u> March 2004</u> . | |
| 2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ T | his action is non-final. | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under the condition of the cond | ' | • |
| Disposition of Claims | | |
| 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with description 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and | lrawn from consideration. | |
| Application Papers | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Exam | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a | • • • | • |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to t | * ' ' | ` ' |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr | , | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a least | ents have been received. ents have been received in A riority documents have been eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | pplication No received in this National Stage |
| | · | |
| Attachment(s) | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) 🔲 Interview S | ummary (PTO-413) |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/I Paper No(s)/Mail Date | Paper No(s | s)/Mail Date iformal Patent Application (PTO-152) |

Art Unit: 1642

Re: Charron et al.

Date of priority: June 21, 2001

Response to Amendment

The Amendment filed 03/25/2004 in response to the Office Action of 12/30/2003

is acknowledged and has been entered.

Claims 1-20 are pending and are currently under consideration.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be

found in a prior Office Action.

Rejections Maintained:

Claims 1-20 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to

comply with the written description requirement for the reasons of record in the Action

mailed 12-30-2003. The written description in this case only sets forth a method for

determining whether a subject has endometrial cancer comprising assaying for GLUTx

expression. Thus, the written description is not commensurate in scope with the claims

drawn to detecting GLUTx expression in a genus of neoplastic-like cellular conditions.

Applicants argue (Response filed 3-25-04, page 6) that the specification supports

the disclosure for a genus of hyperplasias, pre-neoplastic lesions and neoplasms because

in addition to endometrial cancers, working examples are provided in the specification

Page 2

Art Unit: 1642

for metastasizing and non-metastasizing rodent adenocarcinomas breast cancer cells and mouse mammary tumors that were generated by over expression of oncongenes. This argument has been considered but is not found persuasive. The claims are drawn to methods for determining whether a subject has a defect in cell proliferation, comprising assaying a diagnostic sample of the subject for GLUTx expression, wherein detection of GLUTx expression elevated above normal is diagnostic of the defect. However, the written description only reasonably conveys the quantification of GLUTx expression (above normal) in one particular species of cancer- endometrial adenocarcinomas (page 43, lines 5+). Thus, although Applicants have argued that the specification indicates that GLUTx is also expressed in certain rodent breast cancers, there is no comparison or description of GLUTx expression in *normal* rodent breast and or mammary tissues. Thus, the written description does not support the scope of the claimed subject matter drawn to determining a genus of cancerous conditions by detecting GLUTx expression wherein detection of GLUTx expression is elevated above normal. Thus, applicant's arguments have not been found persuasive and the rejection is maintained.

Claims 1-20 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Baughn et al. (US 2003/0171275 A1, December 20, 2000) for the reasons of record.

Applicants argue (page 7) that the reference does not specifically disclose that expression of a polypeptide having the sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO:1 is elevated above normal when a subject has a hyperplasia, a pre-neoplastic lesion, or a neoplasm. This argument has been considered but is not found persuasive. Any elevation above normal or compared to a standard is an inherent consequence of the methods taught in the

Art Unit: 1642

prior art wherein Baughn *et al.* teach that quantities of TRICH (TRICH polypeptides encompass the claimed SEQ ID NO:1) expressed in subject, control, and disease samples from biopsied tissues are compared with the standard values and that "deviation between standard and subject values establishes the parameters for diagnosing disease" (para 247).

Applicants further argue that the reference of Baughn *et al.* does not enable the present invention. Applicants argue that, at best, Baughn *et al.* present an invitation to experiment to determine which TRICH is under expressed or over expressed in association with which disorder. This argument has been considered but is not found persuasive. A reference contains an "enabling disclosure" if the public was in possession of the claimed invention before the date of invention. "Such possession is effected if one of ordinary skill in the art could have combined the publication's description of the invention with his [or her] own knowledge to make the claimed invention." In re Donohue, 766 F.2d 531, 226 USPQ 619 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Further, MPEP 2136.05 lists the guidelines for overcoming a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) which does *not* include arguing that the reference is not enabling. Thus, applicant's arguments have not been found persuasive and the rejection is maintained.

All other rejections and or objections are withdrawn in view of applicant's amendments and arguments there to.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 1642

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gary B. Nickol Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-0835. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 8:30-5:30; alternate Fri., 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on 571-272-0841. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1642

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gary B. Nickol Ph.D. Primary Examiner Art Unit 1642

June 10, 2004

Tang Miles

GARY NICKOL PRIMARY EXAMINER